arXiv:1704.03535v1 [math.OC] 11 Apr 2017

On the Pervasiveness of Difference-Convexity in Optimization and Statistics*

Maher Nouiehed Jong-Shi Pang† Meisam Razaviyayn

Original: February 2017

Abstract

With the increasing interest in applying the methodology of difference-of-convex (dc) optimization to diverse problems in engineering and statistics, this paper establishes the dc property of many well-known functions not previously known to be of this class. Motivated by a quadratic programming based recourse function in two-stage stochastic programming, we show that the (optimal) value function of a copositive (thus not necessarily convex) quadratic program is dc on the domain of finiteness of the program when the matrix in the objective function's quadratic term and the constraint matrix are fixed. The proof of this result is based on a dc decomposition of a piecewise LC^1 function (i.e., functions with Lipschitz gradients). Armed with these new results and known properties of dc functions existed in the literature, we show that many composite statistical functions in risk analysis, including the value-at-risk (VaR), conditional value-at-risk (CVaR), expectation-based, VaR-based, and CVaR-based random deviation functionals are all dc. Adding the known class of dc surrogate sparsity functions that are employed as approximations of the ℓ_0 function in statistical learning, our work significantly expands the family of dc functions and positions them for fruitful applications.

1 Introduction

Long before their entry into the field of optimization in the early 1980's [12, 11, 28, 37], difference-of-convex (dc) functions have been studied extensively in the mathematics literature; the 1959 paper [10] cited a 1950 paper [2] where dc functions were considered. The paper [10] contains a wealth of fundamental results on dc functions that lay the foundation for this class of non-convex functions. While focused on the more general class of "delta-convex functions" in abstract spaces, the thesis [40] contains the very important mixing property of dc functions that in today's language is directly relevant to the dc property of *piecewise functions*. The most recent paper [4] adds to this literature of the mathematics of dc functions with a summary of many existing properties of dc functions. As noted in the last paper, the mapping that Nash employed to show the existence of a mixed equilibrium strategy in his celebrated 1951 paper [22] turns out to be defined by dc functions. This provides another evidence of the relevance of dc functions more than half a century ago. In the optimization literature, applications of the dc methodology to nonconvex optimization problems are well documented in the survey papers [17, 16] and in scattered papers by the pair of authors of the latter papers and their collaborators; adding to these surveys, the paper [14] discusses an application of dc programming to the class of linear programs with complementarity problems; the most recent paper [15] documents many contemporary applied problems in diverse engineering and other disciplines.

*All authors are affiliated with the Daniel J. Epstein Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089-0193, U.S.A. Emails: nouiehed@usc.edu; jongship@usc.edu; razaviya@usc.edu

†This work of this author was based on research partially supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation grants CMMI 1538605 and IIS-1632971.

Our own interest in dc functions stemmed from the optimization of some physical layer problems in signal processing and communication [1, 3, 26]. Most worthy of note in these references are the following. In [26], a novel class of dc functions was identified and an iterative algorithm was described to compute a directional stationary point of a convex constrained dc program; extensions of the algorithm to dc constraints were also presented. In [1], a unified dc representation was given for a host of surrogate sparsity functions that were employed as approximations of the ℓ_0 function in statistical learning; such a representation further confirms the fundamental importance of dc functions in the latter subject that is central to today's field of big-data science and engineering. The paper [25] investigates decomposition methods solving a class of multi-block optimization problems with coupled constraints and partial dc-structure.

The present paper was initially motivated by the desire to understand the dc property of composite risk/deviation functions arising from financial engineering [31, 32]; see Section 3 for a formal definition of these functions. Roughly speaking, these are functions defined as the compositions of some well-known statistical quantities, such as variance, standard deviation, and quantiles, with some random functionals such as the uncertain return of an investment portfolio [29, 30, 33] or the second-stage recourse function [27] in stochastic programming [5, 35]. In the process of this research, we were led to ask the question whether the value-at-risk (VaR) functional of a random portfolio return is a dc function of the asset holdings. While the paper [41] has derived an expression connecting the VaR with the CVaR (conditional value-at-risk) in an attempt to apply the dc algorithm for solving a portfolio optimization problem, the expression derived on page 866 of the cited reference does not constitute a formal proof of the desired dc property of the VaR; this is because the expression depends on the ranking of the portfolio return that changes with the variable holdings. A first contribution of our work is a formula that relates VaR and CVaR and correctly establishes the dc property of the VaR functional for discrete random returns. Interestingly, while the proof of the formula is based solely on linear programming theory, this resulting expression does not seem to have been obtained in the extensive literature on these two important statistical quantities. Our next investigation pertains to a composite risk function involving a recourse function defined by a random quadratic program parameterized by the first-stage decision variable. Our analysis pertains to the general problem where the latter quadratic recourse program is non-convex. A second contribution of our work is a detailed proof showing that the (optimal) value function of a quadratic program (QP) is dc on the domain of finiteness of the program when the matrix in the objective function's quadratic term and the constraint matrix are fixed, under the assumption that the former matrix is copositive on the recession cone of the constraint region. Such a copositive assumption is essential because without it the quadratic program is unbounded below on any non-empty feasible set. In turn, the proof of the said dc property of the QP value function is based on an explicit dc decomposition of a piecewise function with Lipschitz gradients that is new by itself. In addition to these specialized results pertaining to statistical optimization and two-stage stochastic programming, we obtain a few general dc results that supplement various known facts in the literature.

2 Univariate Folded Concave Functions

The family of univariate folded concave functions was introduced [8] in the literature of sparsity representation as approximations of the univariate non-zero count function $\ell_0(t) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$ Formally, such a function is given by $\theta(t) \triangleq f(|t|)$, where f is a continuous, univariate concave function defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$. Since we take the domain of f to be the closed interval $[0, \infty)$, the composition property of dc functions [10, Theorem II, page 708] is not applicable to directly deduce that θ is dc. We formally state and prove the following result that is a unification of all the special cases discussed in [1, 18].

Proposition 1. Let f be a (continuous) univariate concave function defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$. The composite function $\theta(t) \triangleq f(|t|)$ is dc on $\mathbb{R}$ if and only if $f'(0;+)$ exists and is finite, where

$$f'(0;+) \triangleq \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\tau) - f(0)}{\tau} = -\lim_{\tau \uparrow 0} \frac{f(-\tau) - f(0)}{\tau}. \tag{1}$$

Proof. Since a dc function must be directionally differentiable, a property inherited from a convex function, it suffices to prove the sufficiency claim of the result. Since f is concave on $\mathbb{R}_+$, it follows that

$$f(t) \leq f(0) + f'(0;+)\, t, \quad \forall\, t \geq 0. \tag{2}$$

The proof is divided into 2 cases: (a) $f'(0;+) \leq 0$, or (b) $f'(0;+) > 0$. (See Figure 1 for illustration.) In case (a), it follows that $t = 0$ is a maximum of the function θ on the interval $(-\infty, \infty)$ by (2). Further, we claim that the function θ is concave on the real line in this case. To prove the claim, it suffices to show that if $t_1 > 0 > t_2$, then the secant, denoted S, joining the two points $(t_1, \theta(t_1))$ and $(t_2, \theta(t_2))$, where $\theta(t_1) = f(t_1)$ and $\theta(t_2) = f(-t_2)$, on the curve of $\theta(t)$ is below the curve $\theta(t)$ itself for t in the interval (t_2, t_1). This can be argued as follows. The secant S can be divided into two sub-secants, one, denoted S_1, starting at the end point $(t_1, \theta(t_1))$, and ending at $\left(0, \theta(t_2) - \dfrac{\theta(t_1) - \theta(t_2)}{t_1 - t_2}\, t_2\right)$; and the other, denoted S_2, starting at the latter end point and ending at $(t_2, \theta(t_2))$. It is not difficult to see that the sub-secant S_1 lies below the line segment joining $(t_1, \theta(t_1))$ and $(0, \theta(0))$, which in turn lies below the curve of $\theta(t)$ for $t \in (t_1, 0)$ by concavity; furthermore, for the same token, the sub-secant S_2 lies below the line segment joining $(0, \theta(0))$ to $(t_2, \theta(t_2))$, which in turn lies below the curve of $\theta(t)$ for $t \in (0, t_2)$. This establishes the concavity of θ in case (a).

Consider case (b); i.e., suppose $f'(0;+) > 0$. Consider the half-line $t \mapsto f(0) + f'(0;+)t$ emanating from the point $(0, f(0))$ for $t < 0$. Let $t^*_- < 0$ be the right-most $t < 0$ such that this line meets the curve $\theta(t) = f(-t)$ to the left of the origin. If this does not happen, we let $t^*_- = -\infty$. Define the function:

$$f_1(t) \triangleq \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f(t) & \text{if } t \geq 0 \\ f(0) + f'(0;+)t & \text{if } t \in [\, t^*_-, 0\,] \\ f(-t) & \text{if } t < t^*_-, \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{if } t^*_- > -\infty$$

$$f_1(t) \triangleq \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f(t) & \text{if } t \geq 0 \\ f(0) + f'(0;+)t & \text{if } t \in (\, -\infty, 0\,] \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{if } t^*_- = -\infty$$

We claim that this function is concave on $\mathbb{R}$ and $f_1(t) \leq f(-t)$ for $t \in (\, t^*_-, 0\,]$. Indeed, since $f'(0;+) > 0$, it follows that $f(-t) > f(0) + f'(0;+)\, t$ for all $t \in (t^*_-, 0)$ by the definition of t^*_-. The concavity of $f_1(t)$ can be proved in a way similar to the above proof of case (a), by considering sub-segments. Details are omitted. Similarly, define $t^*_+ > 0$ as the left-most $t > 0$ such that half-line $t \mapsto f(0) - f'(0;+)\, t$ meets the curve $\theta(t) = f(t)$ to the right of the origin and let $t^*_+ = \infty$ if this does not happen. Define the function:

$$f_2(t) \triangleq \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f(-t) & \text{if } t \leq 0 \\ f(0) - f'(0;+)t & \text{if } t \in [\, 0, t^*_+\,] \\ f(t) & \text{if } t > t^*_+, \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{if } t^*_+ < \infty$$

$$f_2(t) \triangleq \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f(-t) & \text{if } t \leq 0 \\ f(0) - f'(0;+)t & \text{if } t \in [\, 0, \infty\,) \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{if } t^*_+ = \infty$$

We can similarly show that $f_2(t)$ is concave on $\mathbb{R}$ and $f_2(t) \leq f(t)$ for $t \in [\, 0, t^*_+\,)$. Now define $g(t) \triangleq \max\left(f_1(t), f_2(t)\right)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. As the pointwise maximum of two concave functions, g is dc. It remains



Figure 1: $g(t) = \max\left(f_1(t), f_2(t)\right)$
Case a: $f(|t|) = -|t|^2 - 1$; case b: $f(|t|) = -2(|t| - 1)^2 + 3$; case b: $f(|t|) = \sqrt{(|t| + 1)}$

to show that $g(t) = \theta(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This can be divided into 2 cases: $t \geq 0$ and $t \leq 0$. In each case, the above established properties of the two functions f_1 and f_2 can be applied to complete the proof. □

Remarks. Being not dc, the univariate function $\theta(t) \triangleq \sqrt{|\,t\,|}$ provides a counter-example to illustrate the important role of the existence of the limit (1). Another relevant remark is that the following fact is known [10, page 707]: "if $\mathcal{D}$ is a (bounded or unbounded) interval, then the univariate function f is dc on $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if f has left and right derivatives (where these are meaningful) and these derivatives are of bounded variation on every closed bounded interval interior to $\mathcal{D}$". We have not applied this fact to prove Proposition 1 because our proof provides a simple construction of the dc representation of the function θ in terms of the function f. □

3 Composite Risk Functions

Before proceeding, we should point out that in the rest of the paper, we focus only on the dc property of the functions in question and are not concerned with the lack of coherency of the risk/deviation measures or the computational challenges associated with some of the functionals being studied below. These challenges should best be addressed elsewhere in a computationally oriented study.

For a given scalar $\lambda > 0$ and decision variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, consider the function

$$\mathcal{R}_\lambda(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{Z}(x;\widetilde{\omega})\right] + \lambda\,\mathcal{D}\left[\mathcal{Z}(x;\widetilde{\omega})\right]$$

where $\mathbb{E}$ is the expectation operator with respect to the random variable $\widetilde{\omega}$ defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, with Ω being the sample space, $\mathcal{F}$ being the σ-algebra generated by subsets of Ω, and $\mathbb{P}$ being a probability measure defined on $\mathcal{F}$; $\lambda > 0$ is a given parameter that balances the expectation (for risk neutrality) and the deviation measure $\mathcal{D}$ (representing risk aversion); for a random variable $\mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{Z})$ is a expectation-based, CVaR-based, or VaR-based deviation measure:

Expectation based:

- variance: $\mathrm{var}(\mathcal{Z}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\left\{\left[\mathcal{Z} - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{Z}\right]^2\right\} = \mathbb{E}\left(\mathcal{Z}^2\right) - \left[\,\mathbb{E}\mathcal{Z}\,\right]^2$;
- standard deviation: $\mathrm{stdv}(\mathcal{Z}) \triangleq \sqrt{\mathrm{var}(\mathcal{Z})}$;
- absolute semi-deviation (ASD): $\mathrm{ASD}(\mathcal{Z}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{Z} - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{Z}\right]_+$;
- absolute deviation (AD): $\mathrm{AD}(\mathcal{Z}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\,|\,\mathcal{Z} - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{Z}\,| \;=\; 2\,\mathbb{E}\left[\,\mathcal{Z} - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{Z}\,\right]_+$.

(Conditional) value-at-risk based:

• replace $\mathbb{E}\mathcal{Z}$ in the above definitions of variance, standard deviation, ASD, and ASD by (C)VaR$_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})$, where for a given scalar $\alpha \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CVaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z}) &= \underset{t\in\mathbb{R}}{\text{minimum}} \left[t + \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\,\mathbb{E}\left\{ [\,\mathcal{Z}-t\,]_+ \right\} \right] \\ \text{VaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z}) &\triangleq \min\left\{ t' \mid t' \in \underset{t\in\mathbb{R}}{\text{argmin}} \left[t + \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\,\mathbb{E}\left\{ [\,\mathcal{Z}-t\,]_+ \right\} \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

resulting in $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})$ being one of the four expectations:

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{ [\mathcal{Z}-\text{CVaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})]^2 \right\},\ \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left\{ [\mathcal{Z}-\text{CVaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})]^2 \right\}},\ \mathbb{E}\,[\mathcal{Z}-\text{CVaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})]_+,\ \text{ or }\ \mathbb{E}\,|\mathcal{Z}-\text{CVaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})|,$$

and similarly for the VaR-based deviations. Unlike the equality $\text{AD}(\mathcal{Z}) = 2\text{ASD}(\mathcal{Z})$, it is in general not true that $\mathbb{E}\,|\mathcal{Z}-\text{CVaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})| = 2\mathbb{E}\,[\mathcal{Z}-\text{CVaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})]_+$. The case where $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{Z})$ is itself CVaR$_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})$ or VaR$_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})$ is also covered by our analysis.

We are interested in two particular classes of random functions $\mathcal{Z}(x;\omega)$: (a) bilinear $\mathcal{Z}(x;\omega) = x^T\omega$, and (b) a quadratic recourse function given by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x;\omega) \triangleq \underset{z}{\text{minimum}} \quad & [\,f(\omega)+G(\omega)x\,]^T z + \tfrac{1}{2}\,z^T Q z \\ \text{subject to} \quad & C(\omega)x + Dz \,\geq\, \xi(\omega), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ is a symmetric, albeit not necessarily positive or negative semi-definite, matrix; D is a $k \times m$ matrix, $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\xi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^k$ are vector-valued random functions, and $G : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and $C : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{k\times n}$ are matrix-valued random functions. In the course of demonstrating the dc property of $\mathcal{R}_\lambda(x)$, we will show that both the composite CVaR$_\alpha\,[\psi(x,\widetilde{\omega})]$ and VaR$_\alpha\,[\psi(x,\widetilde{\omega})]$ have this property. A noteworthy point of our analysis is that the matrix Q is not required to be positive semi-definite; thus we allow our recourse function to be derived from an indefinite quadratic program. [A remark: as mentioned above, our work does not address the issue of practical computation. Our goal is to understand the underlying convexity (or more precisely, dc-property) of the composite-risk function $\mathcal{R}_\lambda(x)$ that hopefully can be used in future research in the design of practically efficient algorithms for the optimization of such a non-convex risk function and other dc composite functions of CVaR and VaR.]

Toward the demonstration of the dc property of the composite-risk function $\mathcal{R}_\lambda(x)$ as specified above, we are led to a detailed study of the dc property of piecewise functions. Specifically, a continuous function θ defined on an open set $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is piecewise C^k [7, Definition 4.5.1] for an integer $k \geq 0$ if there exist finitely many C^k functions $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^I$ for some integer $I > 0$, all defined on $\mathcal{O}$, such that $\theta(x) \in \{\theta_i(x)\}_{i=1}^I$ for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$. A major focus of our work is the case of a piecewise quadratic (PQ) θ, which has each θ_i being a (possibly non-convex) quadratic function. It is a well-known fact that a general quadratic function must be dc; subsequently, we extend this fact to a piecewise quadratic function with an explicit dc representation in terms of the pieces. While our analysis relies on several basic results of dc functions that can be found in [4, 10] (see also [38, Chapter 4]), we also discover a number of new results concerning PQ functions that are of independent interest. Summarized below, these results are the pre-requisites to establish the dc property of the composite-risk functions with quadratic recourse.

• A novel expression connecting VaR$_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega})$ and CVaR$_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega})$ when $\widetilde{\omega}$ is a discrete random variable with known (and distinct) probabilities of the scenarios. This expression provides a correct proof of the dc property of the VaR function that distinguishes from the incomplete proof in [41] which does not quite establish the claimed property. Regrettably, the extension of this expression to the case of a continuously distributed random variable $\widetilde{\omega}$ is not known at this time.

• The optimal objective value of the quadratic program (QP):

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b) & \triangleq & \underset{z}{\text{minimum}} & \zeta(z) \triangleq q^T z + \frac{1}{2} z^T Q z \\ & & \text{subject to} & z \in \mathcal{P}_D(b) \triangleq \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Dz \geq b \}, \end{array} \tag{4}$$

is a dc function of (q,b) on the domain $\mathrm{dom}(Q,D) \triangleq \left\{(q,b) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+k} \mid -\infty < \mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b) < \infty\right\}$ of finiteness of the problem, for a fixed pair (Q,D) with Q being a symmetric matrix that is *copositive* on the recession cone of the feasible region $\mathcal{P}_D(b)$; i.e., provided that $v^T Q v \geq 0$ for all $v \in D_\infty \triangleq \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid Dv \geq 0\}$. We let $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(q,b)$ denote the optimal solution set of (4), which is empty for $(q,b) \notin \mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$. It turns out that the analysis of (4) in such a copositive case is not straightforward and uses significant background about the problem and polyhedral theory.

• Motivated by the value function $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b)$, we obtain an explicit min-max (dc) representation of a general (not necessarily convex) piecewise quadratic function with given pieces, extending the work [36] that studies the special case when such a function is convex and also the max-min representation of a piecewise linear function [24, 34], as well as the so-called *mixing property* of dc functions [40, Lemma 4.8] on open convex sets extended to the family of PQ functions whose domains are closed sets.

3.1 An expression connecting VaR and CVaR

In what follows, we derive a formal connection between $\mathrm{VaR}(x^T\widetilde{\omega})$ and $\mathrm{CVaR}(x^T\widetilde{\omega})$ when the random variable $\widetilde{\omega}$ is discretely distributed, showing in particular that the former is a dc function of x. Let $\Omega = \{\omega^1, \cdots, \omega^S\}$ for some integer $S > 0$ and let $\{p_1, \cdots, p_S\}$ be the associated family of probabilities. We then have

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) & = & \min \left\{ t' \mid t' \in \underset{t \in \mathbb{R}}{\mathrm{argmin}} \left(t + \dfrac{1}{1-\alpha} \displaystyle\sum_{s=1}^S p_s \left[x^T\omega^s - t \right]_+ \right) \right\} & \\ & = & \underset{t,u}{\text{minimum}} \quad t & \text{(by representation of the argmin)} \\ & & \text{subject to} \quad t + \dfrac{1}{1-\alpha} \displaystyle\sum_{s=1}^S p_s\, u_s \leq \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) & \\ & & \qquad \left.\begin{array}{rcl} t + u_s & \geq & x^T\omega^s \\ u_s & \geq & 0 \end{array}\right\} \quad s = 1, \cdots, S & \\ & = & \underset{w}{\text{maximum}} \quad -w_0\, \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) + \displaystyle\sum_{s=1}^S w_s\, x^T\omega^s & \text{(by linear programming duality)} \\ & & \text{subject to} \quad -w_0 + \displaystyle\sum_{s=1}^S w_s = 1 & \\ & & \qquad \dfrac{-p_s}{1-\alpha}\, w_0 + w_s \leq 0, \quad s = 1, \cdots, S & \\ & & \text{and} \qquad w_0,\ w_s \geq 0, \quad s = 1, \cdots, S & \\ & = & \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) + \underset{w}{\text{maximum}} \quad \displaystyle\sum_{s=1}^S \left[x^T\omega^s - \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) \right] w_s & \\ & & \qquad\qquad \text{subject to} \quad \dfrac{-p_s}{1-\alpha} \left[\displaystyle\sum_{s'=1}^S w_{s'} - 1 \right] + w_s \leq 0, \quad s = 1, \cdots, S & \\ & & \qquad\qquad \text{and} \qquad w_s \geq 0, \quad s = 1, \cdots, S, & \end{array}$$

where the last equality follows by the substitution: $w_0 = \sum_{s=1}^{S} w_s - 1$ and by noticing that the nonnegativity of w_0 can be dropped, provide that $\{w_s\}_{s=1}^S$ belongs to the fixed set:

$$\mathcal{W} \triangleq \left\{ w \in \mathbf{R}^S_+ \mid \underbrace{\frac{-p_s}{1-\alpha}\left[\sum_{s'=1}^{S} w_{s'} - 1\right] + w_s \leq 0, \quad s = 1, \cdots, S}_{\text{can be written as } \left[\mathbb{I}_S - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} p \mathbf{1}_S^T\right] w + \frac{p}{1-\alpha} \leq 0} \right\},$$

where $\mathbb{I}_S$ is the identity matrix of order S, p is the S-vector of probabilities $\{p_s\}_{s=1}^S$, and $\mathbf{1}_S$ is the S-vector of ones. Let $\left\{ w^j \triangleq (w_s^j)_{s=1}^S \right\}_{j=1}^J$ be the finite family of extreme points of $\mathcal{W}$ for some integer $J > 0$. We then obtain the expression:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) &= \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) + \max_{1\leq j\leq J} \sum_{s=1}^{S} \left[x^T\omega^s - \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) \right] w_s^j = g(x) - h(x), \\
\text{where} \quad g(x) &\triangleq \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) + \max_{1\leq j\leq J} \sum_{s=1}^{S} \left[\left(x^T\omega^s \right) w_j^s + \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) \sum_{j'\neq j} w_s^{j'} \right] \\
\text{and} \quad h(x) &\triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{J}\sum_{s=1}^{S} \left[\mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) \right] w_s^j
\end{aligned}$$

are both convex functions. The expression $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) = g(x) - h(x)$ clearly yields the dc representation of $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega})$ as the difference of two convex piecewise linear functions of x. It is interesting to note that the family $\left\{ w^j \triangleq (w_s^j)_{s=1}^S \right\}_{j=1}^J$ of extreme points of the special set $\mathcal{W}$ depends only on the probabilities $\{p_s\}_{s=1}^S$ and not on the realizations $\{\omega^s\}_{s=1}^S$. Properties of these extreme points are presently not known.

4 A Study of the Value Function $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b)$

Properties of the QP-value function are clearly important for the understanding of the quadratic recourse function $\psi(x, \omega)$, which is equal to $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q(x,\omega), b(x,\omega))$ where $q(x,\omega) \triangleq f(\omega) + G(\omega)x$ and $b(x,\omega) \triangleq \xi(\omega) - C(\omega)x$. In the analysis of the general QP (4), we do not make a semi-definiteness assumption on Q. Instead the copositivity of Q on D_∞ is essential because if there exists a recession vector v in this cone such that $v^TQv < 0$, then for all b for which $\mathcal{P}_D(b) \neq \emptyset$, we have $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b) = -\infty$ for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

We divide the derivation of the dc property (and an associated dc representation) of $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b)$ into two cases: (a) when Q is positive definite, and (b) when Q is copositive on D_∞. In the former case, the dc decomposition is easy to derive and much simpler, whereas the latter case is much more involved. Indeed, when Q is positive definite, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b) &= -\tfrac{1}{2} q^T Q^{-1} q + \min_z \ \tfrac{1}{2} \left(z + Q^{-1}q \right)^T Q \left(z + Q^{-1}q \right) \\
&\qquad \text{subject to} \quad Dz \geq b \\
&= -\tfrac{1}{2} q^T Q^{-1} q + \min_y \ \tfrac{1}{2} y^T Q y \\
&\qquad \text{subject to} \quad Dy \geq b' \triangleq b + DQ^{-1}q.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The lemma below shows that the minimum of the second summand in the above expression is a convex function of the right-hand vector b'. This yields a rather simple dc decomposition of $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b)$. The proof of the lemma is easy and omitted.

Lemma 2. Let $f:\mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ be a strongly convex function and let $D \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times m}$. The value function:

$$\varphi(b) \triangleq \begin{array}{ll} \underset{y}{\text{minimum}} & f(y) \\ \text{subject to} & Dy \geq b \end{array}$$

is a convex function on the domain $\mathrm{Range}(D) - \mathbb{R}^k_+$ which consists of all vectors b for which there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying $Dy \geq b$. □

It is worthwhile to point out that while it is fairly easy to derive the above "explicit" dc decomposition of $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b)$ when Q is positive definite, the same cannot be said when Q is positive semidefinite. Before proceeding further, we refer the reader to the monograph [19] for an extensive study of indefinite quadratic programs. Yet results therein do not provide clear descriptions of the structure of (a) the optimal solution set of the QP (4) for fixed (q,b) and (b) the domain $\mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$ of finiteness, and (c) the optimal value function $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b)$, all when Q is an indefinite matrix. Instead we rely on an early result [9] and the recent study [13] to formally state and prove these desired properties of the QP (4) when Q is copositive on the recession cone of the feasible region. This is the main content of Proposition 4 below. The key to this proposition is the following consequence of a well-known property of a quadratic program which was originally due to Frank-Wolfe and subsequently refined by Eaves [6]; see [19, Theorem 2.2].

Lemma 3. Suppose that Q is copositive on D_∞. A pair $(q,b) \in \mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}_D(b) \neq \emptyset$ and

$$\left.\begin{array}{r} Qv - D^T\eta = 0 \\ 0 \leq \eta \perp Dv \geq 0 \\ Dz \geq b \end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow (q+Qz)^T v \geq 0. \tag{6}$$

Proof. By [19, Theorem 2.2], $(q,b) \in \mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}_D(b) \neq \emptyset$ and

$$\left.\begin{array}{rr} v^TQv = 0, & Dv \geq 0 \\ & Dz \geq b \end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow (q+Qz)^T v \geq 0. \tag{7}$$

By the copositivity of Q on D_∞, we have

$$\left[\, v^TQv = 0, \quad Dv \geq 0 \,\right] \Leftrightarrow \exists\, \eta \text{ such that } \left\{\begin{array}{r} Qv - D^T\eta = 0 \\ 0 \leq \eta \perp Dv \geq 0. \end{array}\right.$$

Thus (7) and (6) are equivalent. □

Interestingly, while the result below is well known in the case of a positive semidefinite Q, its extension to a copositive Q turns out to be not straightforward, especially under no boundedness assumption whatsoever. There is an informal assertion, without proof or citation, of the result below (in particular, part (c)) for a general qp without the copositive assumption [20, page 88]. This is a careless oversight on the authors' part as the proof below is actually quite involved.

Proposition 4. Suppose that Q is copositive on D_∞. The following statements hold:

(a) $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b)$ is continuous on $\mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$;

(b) $\mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$ is the union of finitely many polyhedra (thus is a closed set);

(c) there exists a finite family $\mathcal{F} \triangleq \{S_F\}$ of polyehdra in $\mathbb{R}^{m+k}$ on each of which $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b)$ is a (finite-valued) quadratic function; hence $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b)$ is a piecewise quadratic function on $\mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$;

(d) for each pair $(q,b) \in \mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$, the optimal solution set of the QP (4) is the union of finitely many polyhedra.

Proof. (a) Let $\{(q^\nu, b^\nu)\} \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$ be a sequence of vectors converging to the pair (q^∞, b^∞). For each ν, let $z^\nu \in \mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(q^\nu, b^\nu)$. Note that this sequence $\{z^\nu\}$ need not be bounded. Nevertheless, by the renowned Hoffman error bound for linear inequalities [7, Lemma 3.2.3], it follows that the following two properties hold: (a) $\mathcal{P}_D(b^\infty) \neq \emptyset$ and there exists a sequence $\{\bar{z}^\nu\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_D(b^\infty)$ such that $\{\bar{z}^\nu - z^\nu\} \to 0$; and (b) for every $z \in \mathcal{P}_D(b^\infty)$, there exists, for every ν sufficiently large, a vector $y^\nu \in \mathcal{P}_D(b^\nu)$ such that the sequence $\{y^\nu\}$ converges to z. Hence, for every (η, v) satisfying the left-hand conditions in (6), we have

$$(\, q + Qz \,)^T v \;=\; \lim_{k\to\infty} (\, q + Qy^\nu \,)^T v \;\geq\; 0.$$

Hence $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(q^\infty, b^\infty) \neq \emptyset$; thus $(q^\infty, b^\infty) \in \mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$. Moreover, by taking the vector $z \in \mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(q^\infty, b^\infty)$, we have

$$\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q^\infty, b^\infty) \;=\; \zeta(z) \;=\; \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \zeta(y^\nu) \;\geq\; \limsup_{\nu\to\infty} \zeta(z^\nu) \;=\; \limsup_{\nu\to\infty} \zeta(\bar{z}^\nu) \;\geq\; \liminf_{\nu\to\infty} \zeta(\bar{z}^\nu) \;\geq\; \mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q^\infty, b^\infty)$$

from which it follows that $\lim_{\nu\to\infty} \mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q^\nu, b^\nu) = \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \zeta(z^\nu)$ exists and equals to $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q^\infty, b^\infty)$. Thus (a) holds.

To prove (b), we use an early result of quadratic programming [9] stating that for a pair (q,b) in $\mathrm{dom}(Q,D)$, the value $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q,b)$ is equal to the minimum of the quadratic objective function $\zeta(z)$ on the set of stationary solutions of the problem, and also use the fact [21] that the set of values of ζ on the set of stationary solutions is finite. More explicitly, the stationarity conditions of (4), or Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions, are given by the following mixed complementarity conditions:

$$\begin{array}{c} q + Qz - D^T\eta \;=\; 0 \\ 0 \;\leq\; \eta \;\perp\; Dz - b \;\geq\; 0, \end{array} \tag{8}$$

where $\perp$ denotes the perpendicularity notation, which in this context expresses the complementary slackness between the constraint multiplier η and slack $w \triangleq Dz - b$. In turn the above conditions can be decomposed into a finite, but exponential, number of linear inequality systems by considering the index subsets $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \cdots, k\}$ each with complement $\mathcal{J}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{lcl} q + Qz - (D_{\mathcal{I}\bullet})^T \eta_{\mathcal{I}} & = & 0, \\ D_{\mathcal{I}\bullet} z - b_{\mathcal{I}} \;=\; 0 & \leq & \eta_{\mathcal{I}} \\ D_{\mathcal{J}\bullet} z - b_{\mathcal{J}} \;\geq\; 0 & = & \eta_{\mathcal{J}}. \end{array} \tag{9}$$

The above linear inequality system defines a polyhedral set in $\mathbb{R}^{m+k}$, which we denote $\mathrm{KKT}(\mathcal{I})$. Alternatively, a tuple (q,b) satisfies (9) if and only if there exists $(z, \eta_{\mathcal{I}})$ such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} q \\ b_{\mathcal{I}} \\ b_{\mathcal{J}} \end{pmatrix} \in \begin{bmatrix} -Q & (D_{\mathcal{I}\bullet})^T & 0 \\ D_{\mathcal{I}\bullet} & 0 & 0 \\ D_{\mathcal{J}\bullet} & 0 & -\mathrm{I\!I}_{|\mathcal{J}|} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{R}^m \\ \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}_+ \\ \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}|}_+ \end{pmatrix} \triangleq \underbrace{\mathrm{QD}(\mathcal{I})}_{\text{a polyhedral cone}}.$$

The recession cone of $\mathrm{KKT}(\mathcal{I})$, denoted $\mathrm{KKT}(\mathcal{I})_\infty$, is a polyhedral cone defined by the following homogeneous system in the variables (v, ξ):

$$\begin{array}{lcl} Qv - (D_{\mathcal{I}\bullet})^T \xi_{\mathcal{I}} & = & 0, \\ D_{\mathcal{I}\bullet} v \;=\; 0 & \leq & \xi_{\mathcal{I}} \\ D_{\mathcal{J}\bullet} v \;\geq\; 0 & = & \xi_{\mathcal{J}}. \end{array}$$

This cone is the conical hull of a finite number of generators, which we denote $\left\{\left(v^{\mathcal{I},\ell},\xi^{\mathcal{I},\ell}\right)\right\}_{\ell=1}^{L_{\mathcal{I}}}$ for some integer $L_{\mathcal{I}} > 0$. Notice that these generators depend only on the pair (Q,D). In terms of them, the implication (6) is equivalent to

$$Dz \geq b \;\Rightarrow\; (q+Qz)^T v^{\mathcal{I},\ell} \geq 0, \quad \forall\, \ell = 1,\cdots,L_{\mathcal{I}} \text{ and all subsets } \mathcal{I} \text{ of } \{1,\cdots,k\}.$$

In turn, for a fixed pair $(\mathcal{I},\ell)$, the latter implication holds if and only if

$$0 \leq q^T v^{\mathcal{I},\ell} + \begin{array}{ll} \underset{\mu\geq 0}{\text{maximize}} & b^T\mu \\ \text{subject to} & D^T\mu = Qv^{\mathcal{I},\ell}. \end{array}$$

Let $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{I},\ell) \triangleq \{\mu^{\mathcal{I},\ell,\kappa}\}_{\kappa=1}^{E(\mathcal{I},\ell)}$ be the finite set of extreme points of the polyhedron $\left\{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^k_+ \mid D^T\mu = Qv^{\mathcal{I},\ell}\right\}$ for some positive integer $E(\mathcal{I},\ell)$. Again these extreme points depend only on pair (Q,D) only. It then follows that (6) holds if and only if for every pair $(\mathcal{I},\ell)$ with $\mathcal{I}$ being a subset of $\{1,\cdots,k\}$ and $\ell = 1,\cdots,L_{\mathcal{I}}$, there exists $\mu^{\mathcal{I},\ell,\kappa} \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{I},\ell)$ such that $0 \leq q^T v^{\mathcal{I},\ell} + b^T\mu^{\mathcal{I},\ell,\kappa}$. Together with the feasibility condition $b \in \text{range}(D) - \mathbb{R}^k_+$, each of the latter inequalities in (q,b) defines a polyhedron that defines a piece of $\text{dom}(Q,D)$. Specifically let $\mathcal{V} \triangleq \prod_{(\mathcal{I},\ell)} \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{I},\ell)$ where the Cartesian product ranges over all pairs $(\mathcal{I},\ell)$ with $\mathcal{I}$ being a subset of $\{1,\cdots,k\}$ and $\ell = 1,\cdots,L_{\mathcal{I}}$. An element $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{V}$ is a tuple of extreme points $\mu^{\mathcal{I},\ell,\kappa}$ over all pairs $(\mathcal{I},\ell)$ as specified with κ being one element in $\{1,\cdots,E(\mathcal{I},\ell)\}$ corresponding to the given $\boldsymbol{\mu}$; every such element $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ defines a system of $\sum_{\mathcal{I}\subseteq\{1,\cdots,k\}} |\, L_{\mathcal{I}}\,|$ linear inequalities each of the form:

$$q^T v^{\mathcal{I},\ell} + b^T\mu^{\mathcal{I},\ell,\kappa} \geq 0,$$

Consequently, it follows that

$$\text{dom}(Q,D) = \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\in\mathcal{V}} \left\{ (q,b) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \left[D\mathbb{R}^m - \mathbb{R}^k_+ \right] \mid \underbrace{q^T v^{\mathcal{I},\ell} + b^T\mu^{\mathcal{I},\ell,\kappa} \geq 0}_{\text{there are } \sum_{\mathcal{I}\subseteq\{1,\cdots,k\}} |\, L_{\mathcal{I}}\,| \text{ of these}} \right\},$$

proving that $\text{dom}(Q,D)$ is a union of finitely (albeit potentially exponentially) many polyhedra, each denoted by $\text{dom}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(Q,D)$ for $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{V}$.

To prove (c), let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of polyhedra

$$\left\{\, \text{dom}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(Q,D) \cap \text{QD}(\mathcal{I}') \mid \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{V} \text{ and } \mathcal{I}' \subseteq \{1,\cdots,k\} \,\right\}.$$

For each polyhedron in this family, the system $\text{KKT}(\mathcal{I}')$ has a solution: $(z,\eta_{\mathcal{I}'})$ satisfying:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} q + Qz - (D_{\mathcal{I}'\bullet})^T\eta_{\mathcal{I}'} & = & 0, \\ D_{\mathcal{I}'\bullet}z - b_{\mathcal{I}'} = 0 & \leq & \eta_{\mathcal{I}'} \\ D_{\mathcal{J}'\bullet}z - b_{\mathcal{J}'} \geq 0, & & \end{array} \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{J}'$ is the complement of $\mathcal{I}'$ in $\{1,\cdots,k\}$. Moreover, there exists a matrix $M(\mathcal{I}')$, dependent on the pair (Q,D) only, such that (10) has a solution with $z = M(\mathcal{I}')\begin{pmatrix} q \\ b \end{pmatrix}$; i.e., (10) has a solution that is linearly dependent on the pair (q,b). It is not difficult to show that the objective function $\zeta(z)$ is a

constant on the set of solutions of (10) [in fact, this constancy property is the source of the finite number of values attained by the quadratic function ζ on the set of stationary solutions of the QP (4)], it follows that this constant must be a quadratic function of the pair (q, b). Since for a fixed pair $(q, b) \in \mathrm{dom}(Q, D)$, $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b)$ is the minimum of these constants over all polyhedra in the family $\mathcal{F}$ that contains the pair (q, b), part (c) follows.

Lastly, to prove (d), it suffices to note that for a given pair $(q, b) \in \mathrm{dom}(Q, D)$, the solution set of the QP (4) is equal to set of vectors z for which there exists η such that the pair (z, η) satisfies the linear equality system $\mathrm{KKT}(\mathcal{I})$ and $\frac{1}{2}(q^T z + b^T \eta) = \mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b)$ for some index subset $\mathcal{I}$ of $\{1, \cdots, k\}$. □

4.1 Proof the dc property

Based on Proposition 4 and known properties of piecewise dc functions in general, the following partial dc property of the value function $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b)$ can be proved.

Corollary 5. Suppose that Q is copositive on D_∞. The value function $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b)$ is dc on any open convex set contained in $\mathrm{dom}(Q, D)$.

Proof. This follows from the mixing property of piecewise dc functions; see [4, Proposition 2.1] which has its source from [40, Lemma 4.8]. □

Since $\mathrm{dom}(Q, D)$ is a closed set, the above corollary does not yield the difference-convexity of $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b)$ on its full domain. We give a formal statement of this property in Theorem 8 under the assumption that $\mathrm{dom}(Q, D)$ is convex. The proof of this desired dc property is based on a more general Proposition 7 pertaining to piecewise LC^1 functions that does not require the pieces to be quadratic functions nor the polyehdrality of the sub-domains. In turn, the proof of the latter proposition is based on several elementary facts of dc functions, which we summarize in Lemma 6 below. While these facts all pertain to composite functions and are generally known in the dc literature (see e.g. [10, Theorem II, page 708] and [4, 39]), we give their proofs in order to highlight the respective dc decompositions of the functions in question. Such explicit decompositions are expected to be useful in applications.

Lemma 6. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a convex subset in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The following statements are valid:

(a) The square of a dc function on $\mathcal{D}$ is dc on $\mathcal{D}$.

(b) The product of two dc functions on $\mathcal{D}$ is dc on $\mathcal{D}$.

(c) Let $f_i(x) = g_i(x) - h_i(x)$ be a dc decomposition of f_i on $\mathcal{D}$, for $i = 1, \cdots, I$. Then $\|F(x)\|_2$ is a dc function on $\mathcal{D}$, where $F(x) \triangleq (f_i(x))_{i=1}^I$.

Proof. (a) Let $f = g - h$ be a dc decomposition of f with g and h being both nonnegative convex functions. We have

$$f^2 \;=\; 2\,(\,g^2 + h^2\,) - (\,g + h\,)^2. \tag{11}$$

This gives a dc representation of f^2 because the square of a nonnegative convex function is convex.

(b) Let g and h be any two convex functions on $\mathcal{D}$, we can write

$$g(x)h(x) \;=\; \tfrac{1}{2}\,\left[(\,g(x) + h(x)\,)^2 - g(x)^2 - h(x)^2\,\right],$$

which shows that gh is dc.

(c) Using the fact that $\|v\|_2 = \max_{u\,:\,\|u\|_2=1} u^T v$, we can express

$$\begin{aligned}\| F(x) \|_2 \;&=\; \max_{u\,:\,\|u\|_2=1} \sum_{i=1}^{I} u_i \,(\, g_i(x) - h_i(x)\,) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{I} \left[\underbrace{-g_i(x) - h_i(x)}_{\text{cve function}} \right] + \max_{u\,:\,\|u\|_2=1} \sum_{i=1}^{I} \left[\underbrace{(\,u_i + 1\,)\, g_i(x) + (\,1 - u_i\,)\, h_i(x)}_{\triangleq\, \varphi_i(x,\, u_i)} \right].\end{aligned}$$

Since each $\varphi_i(\bullet, u_i)$ is a convex function and the pointwise maximum of a family of convex functions is convex, the above identity readily gives a dc decomposition of $\|F(x)\|_2$. □

Remark. It follows from the above proof in part (c) that the function $\|F(x)\|_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{I} (g_i(x) + h_i(x))$ is convex. This interesting side-result is based on a pointwise maximum representation of the convex Euclidean norm function; the result can be extended to the composition of a convex with a dc function by using the conjugacy theory of convex functions; see Proposition 11 for an illustrative result of this kind. □

Recall that a function θ is LC^1 (for Lipschitz continuous gradient) on an open set $\mathcal{O}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ if θ is differentiable and its gradient is a Lipschitz continuous function on $\mathcal{O}$. It is known that a LC^1 function is dc with the decomposition $\theta(x) = \left(\theta(x) + \frac{M}{2}\, x^T x\right) - \frac{M}{2}\, x^T x$, where M is a positive scalar larger than the Lipschitz modulus of the gradient function $\nabla\theta$. Another useful fact [23, **3.2.12**] about LC^1 functions is the inequality (12) that is a consequence of a mean-value function theorem of multivariate functions: namely, if θ is LC^1 with $L > 0$ being a Lipschitz modulus of $\nabla\theta$ on an open convex convex set $\mathcal{O}$, then for any two vectors x and y in $\mathcal{O}$,

$$\theta(x) - \theta(y) \;\le\; \nabla\theta(y)^T (x - y) + \frac{L}{2} \,\| x - y \|_2^2. \tag{12}$$

Proposition 7. Let $\theta(x)$ be a continuous function on a convex set $\mathcal{S} \triangleq \bigcup_{i=1}^{I} S^i$ where each S^i is a closed convex set in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Suppose there exist LC^1 functions $\{\theta_i(x)\}_{i=1}^{I}$ defined on an open set $\mathcal{O}$ containing $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\theta(x) = \theta_i(x)$ for all $x \in S^i$ and that each difference function $\theta_{ji}(x) \triangleq \theta_j(x) - \theta_i(x)$ has dc gradients on $\mathcal{S}$. It holds that θ is dc on $\mathcal{S}$.

Proof. Let L_{ji} be the Lipschitz modulus of $\nabla\theta_{ji}$ on $\mathcal{O}$ and let $L_i \triangleq \max_{1\le j\le I} L_{ji}$. Let $\mathrm{dist}(x; S^i) \triangleq \min_{z\in S^i} \| x - z \|_2 = \| x - \Pi_{S^i}(x) \|_2$ be the distance function to the set S^i with $\Pi_{S^i}(x)$ being the Euclidean projection (i.e., closest point) of the vector x onto S^i. We note that both $\mathrm{dist}(\bullet; S^i)$ and $\left[\,\mathrm{dist}(\bullet; S^i)\,\right]^2$ are convex functions. Define

$$\phi_i(x) \;\triangleq\; \underbrace{\mathrm{dist}(x; S^i)}_{\text{cvx in } x}\; \underbrace{\max_{1\le j\le I} \|\nabla\theta_{ji}(x)\|_2}_{\text{dc in } x} + \frac{3\, L_i}{2}\, \left[\,\mathrm{dist}(x; S^i)\,\right]^2, \quad x \,\in\, \mathbb{R}^N$$

and let $\psi_i(x) \triangleq \theta_i(x) + \phi_i(x)$. The first summand, $\mathrm{dist}(x; S^i) \max_{1\le j\le I} \|\nabla\theta_{ji}(x)\|_2$, being the product of two dc functions is dc, by Lemma 6. Hence each function ψ_i is dc. We claim that

$$\theta(x) \;=\; \min_{1\le i\le I} \psi_i(x), \quad \forall\, x \,\in\, \mathcal{S}. \tag{13}$$

Since the pointwise minimum of finitely many dc functions is dc [38, Proposition 4.1], the expression (13) is enough to show that θ is dc on $\mathcal{S}$. In turn since $\psi_i(x) = \theta_i(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$, to show (13), it suffices to show that $\psi_i(x) \geq \theta(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S} \setminus S^i$. For such an x, let $\bar{x}^i \triangleq \Pi_{S^i}(x)$. Since $\mathcal{S}$ is convex, the line segment joining x and $\bar{x}^i$ is contained in $\mathcal{S}$. Hence, there exists a finite partition of the interval $[0, 1]$:

$$0 \,=\, \tau_0 \,<\, \tau_1 \,<\, \cdots \,<\, \tau_T \,<\, \tau_{T+1} \,=\, 1$$

and corresponding indices $i_t \in \{1, \cdots, I\}$ for $t = 1, \cdots, T+1$ so that $\theta(x) = \theta_{i_t}(x)$ for all x in the (closed) sub-segment joining $x^{t-1} \triangleq x + \tau_{t-1}(\bar{x}^i - x)$ to $x^t \triangleq x + \tau_t(\bar{x}^i - x)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta(x) - \theta_i(x) \,&=\, \theta(x) - \theta(\bar{x}^i) + \theta_i(\bar{x}^i) - \theta_i(x) \quad \text{because } \theta(\bar{x}^i) = \theta_i(\bar{x}^i) \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \left[\, \theta_{i_t}(x^{t-1}) - \theta_{i_t}(x^t) \,\right] - \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \left[\, \theta_i(x^{t-1}) - \theta_i(x^t) \,\right] \\
&\qquad\qquad \text{because } \theta(x^{t-1}) = \theta_{i_t}(x^{t-1}) \text{ and } \theta(x^t) = \theta_{i_t}(x^t) \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \left[\, \theta_{i_t}(x^{t-1}) - \theta_i(x^{t-1}) \,\right] - \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \left[\, \theta_{i_t}(x^t) - \theta_i(x^t) \,\right] \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \left[\, \theta_{i_t i}(x^{t-1}) - \theta_{i_t i}(x^t) \,\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \left[\, \nabla\theta_{i_t i}(x^t)^T (\, x^{t-1} - x^t \,) + \frac{L_{i_t i}}{2} \,\|\, x^{t-1} - x^t \,\|_2^2 \right] \quad \text{(by (12))} \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \left\{ \nabla\theta_{i_t i}(x)^T (\, x^{t-1} - x^t \,) + \left[\, \nabla\theta_{i_t i}(x^t) - \nabla\theta_{i_t i}(x) \right]^T (\, x^{t-1} - x^t \,) \right\} + \frac{\max\limits_{1 \leq j \leq I} L_{ji}}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \|\, x^{t-1} - x^t \,\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq I} \|\, \nabla\theta_{i_t i}(x) \,\|_2 \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \|\, x^{t-1} - x^t \,\|_2 + \max_{1 \leq j \leq I} L_{ji} \,\|\, x - \bar{x}^i \,\|_2 \sum_{t=1}^{T+1} \|\, x^{t-1} - x^t \,\|_2 + \frac{L_i}{2} \,\|\, x - \bar{x}^i \,\|_2^2 \\
&= \max_{1 \leq j \leq I} \|\, \nabla\theta_{i_t i}(x) \,\|_2 \,\|\, x - \bar{x}^i \,\|_2 + \frac{3\, L_i}{2} \,\|\, x - \bar{x}^i \,\|_2^2 \,=\, \phi_i(x) \quad \text{because } \|\, x - \bar{x}^i \,\|_2 = \text{dist}(x; S^i)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\psi_i(x) \geq \theta(x)$ for all $x \in S \setminus S^i$ as claimed, and (13) follows readily. □

We are now ready to formally state and prove the following main result of this section.

Theorem 8. Suppose that Q is copositive on D_∞ and that $\text{dom}(Q, D)$ is convex. Then the value function $\text{qp}_{\text{opt}}(q, b)$ is dc on $\text{dom}(Q, D)$.

Proof. This follows readily from Proposition 7 by letting each pair (S_i, θ_i) be the quadratic piece identified in part (c) of Proposition 4. □

Several remarks about the above results are in order. First, when each $\theta_i(x) = x^T a^i + \alpha_i$ is an affine function for some N-vector a^i and scalar α_i, the representation (13) of the function θ becomes

$$\theta(x) \,=\, \min_{1 \leq i \leq I} \left[\, \theta_i(x) + \text{dist}(x; S^i) \max_{1 \leq j \leq I} \|\, a^j - a^i \,\|_2 \right],$$

which provides an alternative min-max representation of the piecewise affine function θ with affine pieces θ_i; this is distinct from the max-min representation of such a piecewise function in [24, 34]. Second, when Q is positive semi-definite, $\text{dom}(Q, D)$ is known to be convex; in fact, it is equal to the polyhedron

$\begin{bmatrix} Q & -D^T \\ D & 0 \end{bmatrix} (\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^k_+) - (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^k_+)$, which is the set of pairs (q, b) for which the linear constraints (without the complementarity condition) of the KKT system (8) are feasible. Third, there are copositive, non-convex QPs for which $\mathrm{dom}(Q, D)$ is convex. For instance, for a symmetric, (entry-wise) positive matrix Q and an identity matrix D, $\mathrm{dom}(Q, D)$ is equal to the entire space $\mathbb{R}^{m+k}$. More generally, if $D_\infty = \{0\}$, then for any symmetric matrix Q, $\mathrm{dom}(Q, D) = \mathbb{R}^m \times \left[D\mathbb{R}^m - \mathbb{R}^k_+ \right]$ is a convex polyhedron. Fourth, the convexity of $\mathcal{S}$ in Proposition 7 is a reasonable assumption because convex, and thus dc, functions are defined only on convex sets. Hence, the convexity requirement of $\mathrm{dom}(Q, D)$ in Theorem 8 is needed for one to speak about the dc property of $\mathrm{qp}_{\mathrm{opt}}(q, b)$. Admittedly, the dc representation in Theorem 8 is fairly complex, due to the possibly exponentially many quadratic pieces of the value function (cf. the proof of Proposition 4). This begs the question of whether a much simpler representation exists when the matrix Q is positive semi-definite (cf. the rather straightforward representation (5) in the positive definite case). There is presently no resolution to this question.

5 Composite Statistical Functions

Based on the results in the last section, we establish that all the composite risk functions described in Section 3 are dc. Specifically, let $f(x, \omega) = p(x, \omega) - q(x, \omega)$ be a dc function in $x \in \mathcal{D}$ for every fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, where both $p(\bullet, \omega)$ and $q(\bullet, \omega)$ are convex, which if needed can be assumed to be nonnegative without loss of generality. With $\mathcal{Z} \triangleq f(x, \widetilde{\omega})$, we will show that all the functions below are dc on $\mathcal{D}$:

- $\mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})$
- $\mathrm{var}(\mathcal{Z})$, $\mathrm{stdv}(\mathcal{Z})$, and $\mathrm{ASD}(\mathcal{Z}) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{AD}(\mathcal{Z})$
- $\mathbb{E}\left\{ [\mathcal{Z} - (\mathrm{C})\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})]^2 \right\}$ and $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left\{ [\mathcal{Z} - (\mathrm{C})\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})]^2 \right\}}$
- $\mathbb{E}\,[\mathcal{Z} - (\mathrm{C})\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})]_+$ and $\mathbb{E}\,|\mathcal{Z} - (\mathrm{C})\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})|$.

Among these, it suffices to show that the four functions $\mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})$, $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})$, $\mathrm{var}(\mathcal{Z})$, and $\mathrm{stdv}(\mathcal{Z})$ are dc. The proofs along with existing properties of dc functions (such as the nonnegative part of a dc function is dc) will readily establish the dc-property of the remaining functions and also yield their dc decompositions. Among the former four functions, the proof of $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\mathrm{stdv}(\mathcal{Z})$ requires the random variable $\widetilde{\omega}$ to be discretely distributed.

5.1 CVaR and VaR

The following result shows that $\mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(f(x, \widetilde{\omega}))$ is a dc function if $f(\cdot, \omega)$ is dc for fixed realization ω.

Proposition 9. For every $\omega \in \Omega$, let $f(x, \omega) = p(x, \omega) - q(x, \omega)$ be the dc decomposition of $f(\bullet, \omega)$ on a convex set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Then for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(f(x, \widetilde{\omega})) = \underbrace{\min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ t + \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\,\mathbb{E}\,[\max(\,p(x, \widetilde{\omega}) - t, q(x, \widetilde{\omega})\,)\,] \right\}}_{\text{cvx in } x} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\,\mathbb{E}\,[\,q(x, \widetilde{\omega})\,]}_{\text{cvx in } x}.$$

Proof. The equality is fairly straightforward. The convexity of the minimum is due to the joint convexity of the function $(x, t) \mapsto t + \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\,\mathbb{E}\,[\max(\,p(x, \widetilde{\omega}) - t, q(x, \widetilde{\omega})\,)\,]$. □

Replacing the bilinear function $x^T\omega$ with $f(x, \omega)$ in Section 3.1, we obtain, for a discretely distributed

random variable $\widetilde{\omega}$ with realizations $\{w^s\}_{s=1}^S$ and associated probabilities $\{p_s\}_{s=1}^S$,

$$\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(f(x,\widetilde{\omega})) \;=\; \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(f(x,\widetilde{\omega})) + \max_{1\le j\le J} \sum_{s=1}^S \left[\, f(x,\omega^s) - \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(f(x,\widetilde{\omega}))\,\right] w_s^j,$$

which together with Proposition 9 shows that $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(f(x,\widetilde{\omega}))$ is dc in x if $f(\bullet,\omega^s)$ is dc for all $s = 1,\cdots,S$.

To end the discussion of the value-at-risk, we show that $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega})$ is a convex function (for $\alpha < 1/2$), a concave function (for $\alpha > 1/2$), and a linear function (for $\alpha = 1/2$) if $\widetilde{\omega}$ is a multivariate normal random variable with mean μ and (positive definite) covariance matrix Σ. As such $x^T\widetilde{\omega}$ is normally distributed with mean $x^T\mu$ and variance $x^T\Sigma x$. Thus, for $x \neq 0$, $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega})$ is the scalar t such that

$$1-\alpha \;=\; \mathrm{Prob}\left\{x^T\widetilde{\omega} \ge t\right\} \;=\; \mathrm{Prob}\left\{\frac{x^T\widetilde{\omega} - x^T\mu}{\sqrt{x^T\Sigma x}} \ge \frac{t - x^T\mu}{\sqrt{x^T\Sigma x}}\right\} \;=\; \mathbb{Q}\left(\frac{t-x^T\mu}{\sqrt{x^T\Sigma x}}\right),$$

where $\mathbb{Q}(\tau) \triangleq \dfrac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\displaystyle\int_\tau^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right) du$ is the well-known Q-function associated with a standard normal distribution. Letting $C \triangleq \mathbb{Q}^{-1}(1-\alpha)$, it follows from the above expression that

$$\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega}) \;=\; x^T\mu + C\,\sqrt{x^T\Sigma x}$$

which remains valid when $x = 0$. Since $\sqrt{x^T\Sigma x}$ is a convex function, the claimed convexity, concavity, or linearity property of $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(x^T\widetilde{\omega})$ follows readily.

5.2 Composite deviation functionals

Utilizing the expression (11), we give a dc decomposition of $\mathrm{var}(f(x,\widetilde{\omega}))$.

Proposition 10. For every $\omega \in \Omega$, let $f(x,\omega) = p(x,\omega) - q(x,\omega)$ be a dc decomposition of $f(\bullet,\omega)$ on $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with $p(\bullet,\omega)$ and $q(\bullet,\omega)$ both nonnegative and convex. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{var}(f(x,\widetilde{\omega})) \;=\; & 2\,\underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[p(x,\widetilde{\omega})^2 + q(x,\widetilde{\omega})^2\right] + \left\{\,\mathbb{E}\left[p(x,\widetilde{\omega})\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[q(x,\widetilde{\omega})\right]\,\right\}^2}_{\text{cvx in } x} \\ & - \left\{ \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\,p(x,\widetilde{\omega}) + q(x,\widetilde{\omega})\,\right\}^2\right] + 2\left[\,\left(\,\mathbb{E}\left[p(x,\widetilde{\omega})\right]\,\right)^2 + \left(\,\mathbb{E}\left[q(x,\widetilde{\omega})\right]\,\right)^2\right]}_{\text{cvx in } x} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{var}(f(x,\widetilde{\omega})) \;=\; \mathbb{E}\left[f(x,\widetilde{\omega})^2\right] - \left\{\,\mathbb{E}\left[f(x,\widetilde{\omega})\right]\,\right\}^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[2\left\{\,p(x,\widetilde{\omega})^2 + q(x,\widetilde{\omega})^2\,\right\} - \left\{\,p(x,\widetilde{\omega}) + q(x,\widetilde{\omega})\,\right\}^2\right] \\ &\qquad - \left\{\,2\left[\,\left(\,\mathbb{E}\left[p(x,\widetilde{\omega})\right]\,\right)^2 + \left(\,\mathbb{E}\left[q(x,\widetilde{\omega})\right]\,\right)^2\right] - \left(\,\mathbb{E}\left[p(x,\widetilde{\omega})\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[q(x,\widetilde{\omega})\right]\,\right)^2\right\},\end{aligned}$$

from which (14) follows readily. □

The proof that $\mathrm{stdv}(f(x,\widetilde{\omega}))$ is dc requires $\widetilde{\omega}$ to be discretely distributed and is based on the expression:

$$\mathrm{stdv}(f(x,\widetilde{\omega})) \;=\; \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^S p_s \left[\underbrace{f(x,\omega^s) - \sum_{s'=1}^S p_{s'}\, f(x,\omega^{s'})}_{\text{dc in } x}\right]^2};$$

thus, $\mathrm{stdv}(f(x,\widetilde{\omega}))$ is the 2-norm of the vector dc function $x \mapsto \left(\sqrt{p_s} \left[f(x,\omega^s) - \sum_{s'=1}^{S} p_{s'} f(x,\omega^{s'}) \right] \right)_{s=1}^{S}$ (i.e., all its components are dc functions). As such, the dc-property of $\mathrm{std}(f(\bullet,\widetilde{\omega}))$ follows from part (c) of Lemma 6.

We end the paper with a brief discussion of the well-known log likelihood function in statistics. Specifically, using the theory of conjugate functions in convex analysis, we give a dc decomposition of the expected-value function $\mathbb{E}\,[\log(f(x,\widetilde{\omega}))]$ on a convex domain where the dc function $f(\bullet,\omega)$ is bounded away from zero. For this purpose, let $\widetilde{\omega}$ be discretely distributed as above. Combined with the dc representation in Proposition 11 below, the expression

$$\mathbb{E}\,[\log(f(x,\widetilde{\omega}))] \;=\; \sum_{s=1}^{S} p_s \,\log(f(x,\omega^s))$$

easily yields the dc property and decomposition of the expected-value logarithmic functional.

Proposition 11. Let $\theta(x) = -\log(f(x))$ where $f(x) = p(x) - q(x)$ is a positive dc function on a convex set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. For every scalar $M > 0$, the function $\theta(x) + M\,p(x)$ is convex on any convex subset of $\{x \in \mathcal{D} \mid f(x) \geq 1/M\}$; thus θ has the dc decomposition $\theta(x) = [\,\theta(x) + M\,p(x)\,] - M\,p(x)$ on such a subset.

Proof. We begin with the conjugate function of the univariate convex function $\zeta(t) \triangleq -\log(t)$ for $t > 0$. Indeed, we have

$$\zeta^*(v) \;\triangleq \sup_{t>0} \{\, v\,t + \log(t) \,\} \;=\; -1 - \log(-v), \quad \text{for } v \,<\, 0.$$

Hence, by double conjugacy,

$$-\log(t) \;=\; \sup_{v<0} \{\, v\,t + 1 + \log(-v) \,\}, \quad \text{for } t \,>\, 0,$$

where the sup is attained at $v = -1/t$. Consequently, if $p(x) - q(x) \geq 1/M$, then

$$\begin{aligned} -\log\left(p(x) - q(x)\right) \;&=\; \sup_{v<0} \{\, v\,(\,p(x) - q(x)\,) + 1 + \log(-v) \,\} \\ &=\; \sup_{-M\leq v<0} \{\, v\,(\,p(x) - q(x)\,) + 1 + \log(-v) \,\} \\ &=\; \sup_{-M\leq v<0} \left\{ \underbrace{(\,v + M\,)\,p(x) + (\,-v\,)\,q(x) + 1 + \log(-v)}_{\text{cvx in } x} \right\} - M\,p(x). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\theta(x) + M\,p(x)$ is equal to the pointwise maximum of a family of convex functions, hence is convex. □

Acknowledgement. The authors acknowledge some fruitful discussion with Professor Defeng Sun at the National University of Singapore during his visit to the University of Southern California.

References

[1] M. Ahn, J.S. Pang, and J. Xin. Difference-of-convex learning: directional stationarity, optimality, and sparsity. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, revision under review (as of February 2017).

[2] A.D. Alexandroff. Surfaces represented by the difference of convex functions. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR (N.S.)* 72 (1950) 613-616. [English translation: *Siberian Èlektron. Mathetical. Izv.* 9 (2012) 360-376.]

[3] A. Alvarado, G. Scutari, and J.S. Pang. A new decomposition method for multiuser DC-programming and its application to physical layer security. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 62 (2014) 2984–2998.

[4] M. Bačák and J.M. Borwein. On difference convexity of locally Lipschitz functions. *Optimization* 60 (2011) 961–978.

[5] J.R. Birge and F. Louveaux. *Introduction to Stochastic Programming*. Springer Series in Operations Research (Springer, New York 1997).

[6] B.C. Eaves. On quadratic programming. *Management Science 17* (1971) 698–711.

[7] F. Facchinei and J.S. Pang. *Finite-Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems*, Volumes I and II. Springer-Verlag, New York (2003).

[8] J. Fan, L. Xue, and H. Zou. Strong oracle optimality of folded concave penalized estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* 42 (2014) 819–849 (2014).

[9] F. Giannessi and E. Tomasin. Nonconvex quadratic programs, linear complementarity problems, and integer linear programs. In R. Conti and A. Ruberti, editors. Fifth Conference on Optimization Techniques (Rome 1973), Part I, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Volume 3, Springer (Berlin 1973) pp. 437–449.

[10] P. Hartman. On functions representable as a difference of convex functions. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 9 (1959) 707-713.

[11] J.B. Hiriart-Urruty. Generalized differentiability, duality and optimization for problems dealing with differences of convex functions. In J. Ponstein, editor. *Convexity and Duality in Optimization*. Proceedings of the Symposium on Convexity and Duality in Optimization Held at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands June 22, 1984. (1985) 37–70.

[12] R. Horst and N.V. Thoai. D.C. programming: Overview. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 103 (1999) 1–43.

[13] J. Hu, J.E. Mitchell, and J.S. Pang. An LPCC approach to nonconvex quadratic programs. *Mathematical Programming* 133 (2012) 243–277.

[14] F. Jara-Moroni, A. Waechter, and J.S. Pang. A study of the difference-of-convex approach for solving linear programs with complementarity constraints. *Mathematical Programming, Series B*, original submitted February 2016 (in revision as of February 2017).

[15] H.A. Le Thi and D.T. Pham. DC programming and DCA : thirty years of developments Manuscript, University of Lorraine (2016).

[16] H.A. Le Thi and D.T. Pham. Recent advances in DC programming and DCA. *Transactions on Computational Collective Intelligence* 8342 (2014) 1–37.

[17] H.A. Le Thi and D.T. Pham. The DC programming and DCA revised with DC models of real world nonconvex optimization problems. *Annals of operations research* 133 (2005) 25–46.

[18] H.A. Le Thi, D.T. Pham, and X.T. Vo. DC approximation approaches for sparse optimization. *European Journal of Operations Research* 244 (2015) 26–46.

[19] G.M. Lee, N.N. Tam, and N.D. Yen. *Quadratic Programming and Affine Variational Inequalities A Qualitative Study*. Springer e-book (New York 2005).

[20] Z.Q. Luo, J.S. Pang, and D. Ralph. *Mathematical Programs With Equilibrium Constraints*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, England 1996).

[21] Z.Q. Luo and P. Tseng. Error bound and convergence analysis of matrix splitting algorithms for the affine variational inequality problem. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 2 (1992) 43–54.

[22] J. Nash. Non-cooperative games. *Annal of Mathematics* 54(2): (1951) 286–295.

[23] J.M. Orgeta and W.C. Rheinboldt. *Iterative Solution of Nonlinear Equations in Several Variables*. Classics in Applied Mathematics, SIAM Publications (Philadelphia 2000).

[24] S. Ovchinnikov. Max-min representation of piecewise linear functions. *Contributions to Algebra and Geometry* 43 (2002) 297–302.

[25] J.S. Pang and M. Tao. Decomposition methods for computing directional stationary solutions of a class of non-smooth non-convex optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, submitted January 2017.

[26] J.S. Pang, M. Razaviyayn, and A. Alvarado. Computing B-stationary points of nonsmooth dc programs. *Mathematics of Operations Research*; accepted February 2016 `http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/moor.2016.0795`.

[27] J.S. Pang, S. Sen and U. Shanbhag. Two-stage non-cooperative games with risk-averse players. *Mathematical Prgramming, Series B* (revision submitted November 2016; original December 2015).

[28] D.T. Pham and H.A. Le Thi. Convex analysis approach to DC programming: Theory, algorithm and applications. *Acta Mathematica Vietnamica* 22 (1997) 289–355.

[29] R.T. Rockafellar and S. Uryasev. Optimization of conditional value-at-risk. *Journal of Risk* 2 (2000) 21–41.

[30] R.T. Rockafellar and S. Uryasev. Conditional value-at-risk for general loss distributions. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 7 (2002) 1143–1471.

[31] R.T. Rockafellar, S. Uryasev, and M. Zabarankin. Optimality conditions in portfolio analysis with general deviation measures. *Mathematical Programming, Series B* 108 (2006) 515–540.

[32] R.T. Rockafellar, S. Uryasev, and M. Zabarankin. Generalized deviations in risk analysis. *Finance and Stochastics* 10 (2006) 51–74.

[33] S. Sarykalin and S. Uryasev. Value-at-risk versus conditional value-at-risk in risk management and optimization. *Tutorials in Operations Research* (2008) pp. 269–294.

[34] S. Scholtes. *Intoduction to Piecewise Differentiable functions*. Springer Briefs in Optimization (2012).

[35] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczynski. *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*. SIAM Publications (Philadelphia 2009).

[36] J. Sun. On the structure of convex piecewise quadratic functions. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 72 (1992) 499–510.

[37] H. Tuy. Global minimization of a difference of two convex functions. *Mathematical Programming Study* 30 (1987) 150-187.

[38] H. Tuy. *Convex Analysis and Global Optimization*. Second edition. Springer Optimization and its Applications 110 (2016). [First edition. Kluwer Publishers (Dordrecht 1998).]

[39] L. Veselý and L. Zajíček. On composition of d.c. functions and mappings. *Journal of Convex Analysis* 16 (2009) 423–439.

[40] L. Veselý and L. Zajíček. Delta-convex mappings between Banach spaces and applications. Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.) 289 (1989).

[41] D. Wozabal. Value-at-risk optimization using the difference of convex algorithm. *OR Spectrum* 34 (2012) 861–883.